UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,284	01/17/2002	William Swinton	LS/0028.01	4842

8791 7590 02/28/2007

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER	
BATES, KEVIN T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/052,284	SWINTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Bates	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-42,44-61 and 63-70* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-42, 44-61 and 63-70* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on January 29, 2007.

Claims 1-20, 43 and 62 have been cancelled.

Claims 21-30, 34-35, 40, 42, 49, 51-54, 67, and 70 have been amended.

Claims 21-42, 44-61 and 63-70 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21-27, 29-39, 41-42, 44-53, 55-58, 60-62, and 63-70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cortjens (5526037).

Regarding claim 21, Cortjens teaches a media capture device system allowing a user interface of a media capture device to be supported at least in part by a second device (Column 5, lines 30 – 42), the system comprising: a module for generating at least one high-level event message indicating that an event has occurred that is relevant to the media capture device (Column 8, line 60 – Column 9, line 1); a router on-board the media capture device for determining whether said at least one abstract message is handled locally at the media capture device or remotely at the second device (Column 8, lines 34 – 44; Column 6, lines 34 – 41); a mapper on-board the media capture device for mapping said at least one high-level message into at least one

lower-level message for controlling one or more hardware elements controlled by the second device (Column 5, lines 55 – 59; Column 6, lines 34 – 40); and a module for communicating said at least one lower-level message to the second device, such that the second device may activate one or more hardware elements that are appropriate for said event that has occurred (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claim 22, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said media capture device is temporarily connected to said second device (Column 3, line 54 – Column 4, line 1, where a remote device can temporarily connect to a local converted with the necessary software and control the system through the network connection, without the need for a permanent hardware and connection).

Regarding claim 23, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein media capture device is permanently connected to said second device (Figure 1, element 17 and 13).

Regarding claim 24, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said media capture device connects to said second device via wireless communication (Column 13, lines 43 – 45).

Regarding claim 25, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said media capture device connects to said second device via wireline communication (Column 9, lines 25 – 26).

Regarding claim 26, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said media capture device comprises a client device that is hosted by said second device (Column 5, lines 30 – 42).

Regarding claim 29, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said media capture device also includes hardware elements capable of being controlled by said at least one lower-level message (Column 5, lines 55 – 59).

Regarding claim 31, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said at least one high-level message is a logical user interface message indicating a logical user interface manifestation that should occur (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claim 32, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said at least one high-level message itself does not specify activation of particular hardware elements on the second device (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claim 33, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said at least one lower-level message does specify activation of one or more particular hardware elements on the second device (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claim 34, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said media capture device comprises a client device and wherein said second device comprises a host device to which the client device occasionally connects (Column 3, line 54 – Column 4, line 1, where a remote device can temporarily connect to a local converted with the necessary software and control the system through the network connection, without the need for a permanent hardware and connection).

Regarding claim 36, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said event comprises a user event (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claim 37, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 36, wherein said user event comprises user-supplied input (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claim 38, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 36, wherein said user event comprises use activation of an input element (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claim 39, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 38, wherein said input element comprises an input button (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claim 41, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 38, wherein said user input element resides on said second device (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claim 42, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 41, further comprising: a module for transmitting a notification to said first device in response to user activation of said user input element residing on said second device (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claim 45, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said at least one particular hardware element comprises an LED (light-emitting diode) (Column 12, lines 53 – 67).

Regarding claim 46, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said at least one particular hardware element comprises a bitmap display (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claim 49, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 21, wherein said first device may be embedded within said second device (Column 5, lines 49 – 51).

Regarding claim 60, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 58, wherein said user input element resides on the host device (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claim 61, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 60, further comprising: the router for transmitting a notification to the client device in response to the user activating the input element on the host device (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claim 51, Cortjens teaches an interface system allowing a client device to be partially supported by a host device (Column 5, lines 30 – 42), the system comprising: an onboard interface engine on the client device for generating at least one high-level event message indicating that an event has occurred on the client device (Column 8, line 60 – Column 9, line 1); a router in the client device to determine whether the at least one high level event message should be handled locally at the client device or remotely at the host (Column 8, lines 34 – 44); a state transition table to the client device transition to a new state based at least one high level event and the client device's present state; and a module to update the client device's current state information (Column 9, lines 6 – 16); and a mapper for mapping said at least one high-level message into at least one lower-level message for controlling one or more hardware elements controlled by the host device (Column 5, lines 55 – 59).

Regarding claim 52, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 51, further comprising an event handler for communicating said at least one lower-level message to the second device, such that the second device may activate one or more hardware elements that are appropriate for the event that occurred (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claim 55, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 51, wherein the client device further comprises hardware elements capable of being controlled by the lower-level message (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claim 57, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 51, wherein the high-level message is a user interface message designed for display to a user (Column 18, lines 57 – 63).

Regarding claims 27 and 53, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 21 and 51, wherein said first device includes media capture capability (Column 18, lines 64 – 67).

Regarding claims 30 and 56, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 21 and 51, wherein said at least one high-level message is generated, at least in part, based on a then-current state of the first device (Column 8, line 60 – Column 9, line 1).

Regarding claims 44 and 63, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 21 and 51, wherein said at least one particular hardware element comprises an element capable of generating a display (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claims 47 and 64, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 46 and 63, wherein said bitmap display shows an icon in response to receipt at the second device of said at least one lower-level message (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claims 48 and 65, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 21 and 51, wherein said at least one particular hardware element comprises an element capable of generating sound (Column 20, lines 16 – 25).

Regarding claims 50 and 66, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 21 and 51, wherein said module for communicating said at least one lower-level message to the second device employs a configurable table so that the second device itself may be selected from different classes of devices (Column 2, lines 64 – 66).

Regarding claim 67, Cortjens teaches a method comprising: receiving a notification at a media capture device, indicating that an event has occurred with respect to the media capture device; determining, at a router on-board the media capture device, whether the event should be handled locally at the device or remotely at a second device (Column 8, lines 34 – 44); when the event is to be handled locally, processing the event locally at the media capture device (Column 8, lines 34 – 44; Column 6, lines 34 – 41); transmitting a message to the second device, intended to activate a hardware element on the second device; activating a hardware element on the second device, in response to the message (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Regarding claim 68, Cortjens teaches the system of claim 67, wherein said event comprises a user event (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claims 58 and 69, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 51 and 68, wherein the event comprises a user event selected from among the following: a user supplied input, a user activation of an input element; a status change (Column 6, lines 20 – 45).

Regarding claims 35 and 70, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 21 and 67, wherein said module for generating at least one high-level event message determines a new state that is appropriate for the first device to transition to; and generates at least one high-level message appropriate for indicating the transition to said new state (Column 9, lines 6 – 16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cortjens (5526037) in view of Creamer (6930709).

Regarding claims 40 and 59, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 38 and 58.

Cortjens does not explicitly indicate that said input element resides on the client device.

Creamer teaches a system for viewing a digital camera over a network that includes receiving state change and input notifications on a second device over a network (Column 6, lines 36 – 58) and that the input interaction can be performed on the actual first device (Column 6, lines 43 – 46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive alerts and reports about event data which includes user interaction with the first client taught in Creamer, in Cortjen's system in order to allow for some image formation and user interaction, without requiring controls from the external source, while maintaining the correct reporting and alert information.

Claims 28 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cortjens in view of Maurinus (5606365).

Regarding claims 28 and 54, Cortjens teaches the system of claims 21 and 51.

Cortjens does not explicitly indicate that said second device includes cellular phone capability.

Maurinus teaches remote monitoring of perpherial devices which includes transmitting low level messages over a cellular network to the second device (Column 8, lines 39 – 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Maurinus' teaching of sending the information from a digital camera over a cellular network in order to provide a method of long distance wireless communication.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 29, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the reference, Cortjens, does not teach a media capture device that includes a router and a mapper as claimed in the invention. The examiner disagrees, as seen in Column 6, lines 9 – 13; lines 34 – 41; and Column 8, lines 39 – 42, the reference teaches a Controller (Figure 1, element 10) which operates to receive signals from device on the network, such as the mouse and audio, receives those messages as network signals, maps those signals into actions such as other network signals sent to a remote controller or devices within the local network (Column 8, lines 29 – 31). So as seen, the controller is one device, that performs those actions on board, and those actions include routing high level messages (the actions such as

mouse movement and camera panning) as low level network signals. They are mapped and routed over the network, so they meet the limitations of the claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KB
February 26, 2007

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER